DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 143 SP 027 058

AUTHOR	Peterson, Ken; And Others
TITLE	Utah Teacher Evaluation Project: The Park City Career Ladder Design. Final Report: Secretary's Discretionary Program, Planning Grant to Develop Teacher Incentive Programs.
INSTITUTION	Utah Univ., Salt Lake City.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1 Jun 85
GRANT	G008400255
NOTE	46p.; A collaborative planning effort between the University of Utah, Department of Educational Studies and the Park City School District.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Ladders; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Problems; Incentive Grants; *Job Performance; Master Teachers; *Professional Development; *Program Development; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS	Utah

ABSTRACT

The Park City School District (Utah) career ladder design provides a system in which teachers are positioned and paid according to successful performance and differentiation of responsibilities. It includes an evaluation system to differentiate among teachers. The career ladder design presents a number of innovations; for example, excellent teaching is recognized in a variety of forms. It improves existing tools, e.g. student reports. The design uses lines of evidence which other systems neglect, such as pupil gain and parent input. It addresses the problems of madatory evidence systems, such as whether or not to require all teachers to take standardized tests, by emphasizing teacher decision making. This report begins with a description of the career ladder structure. It then describes teacher evaluation and decision making systems. It concludes with a description of evaluation procedures. The appendices include issues about the lines of evidence, evaluation forms, critiques of the system by outside audiences, and a bibliography of resources used in the design. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED265143

FINAL REPORT: SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM, PLANNING GRANT TO DEVELOP TEACHER INCENTIVE STRUCTURES

U.S Department of Education Grant # G008400255

UTAH TEACHER EVALUATION PROJECT:

THE PARK CITY CAREER LADDER DESIGN

A collaborative planning effort between the University of Utah Department of Educational Studies and the Park City School District.

Ken Peterson, Ph.D., University of Utah
Director & Principal Investigator
Don Kauchak, Ed.D., University of Utah
Principal Investigator
Anthony Mitchell, Ph.D., Park City School District
Sara McCarthey, M.A., Salt Lake City School District
Vicki Lambert, Ph.D., Granite School District
Dannelle Stevens, M.A., University of Utah

June 1, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 027 058

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

UTAH TEACHER EVALUATION PROJECT:
THE PARK CITY DESIGN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Career Ladder System..... 2
Notes on Ladder Rung Postions..... 3
Features of Career Ladder System..... 4
Decision Making..... 5
Costs..... 7
District Support Provisions..... 7
Change Over to New System..... 8

III. Teacher Evaluation: The Dossier System.... 8
Lines of Evidence..... 9
Decision Making.....10

IV. Guidelines for Using Lines of Evidence.....11

APPENDICES

A. Issues Concerning Lines of Evidence
B. Forms
C. External Audience Reviews
D. Promotion Panel Letters
D. Bibliography

UTAH TEACHER EVALUATION PROJECT: THE PARK CITY DESIGN

The Park City design challenge was to construct a system in which teachers are positioned and paid according to (a) successful performance and (b) differentiation of responsibilities. The task called for design of a structure or "career ladder," and an evaluation system to differentiate among teachers.

Teachers in the United States typically have identical or very similiar job descriptions within school districts (Hatry & Greiner, 1984). A uniform salary schedule is used to avoid inequity. Tenure systems protect against arbitrary termination. There is interest in changing these structures toward differentiated staffing based on performance in order to provide opportunities for leadership and increased role flexiblility. Such innovations are expected to attract a wider variety of persons to the teaching profession, and to acknowledge and reward existing quality performance (Commission of the States, 1983).

Current teacher evaluation is limited in sophistication and purpose (Peterson, 1984; Scriven, 1981). Administrator reports are used for retention purposes; they are privately done between principal and teacher, and serve the needs of few audiences. Inadequacies of principal reports are barely noticeable when used for minor functions. But under demands of public scrutiny, career ladder placement, and need for teaching to be competitive in terms of rewards, they clearly are outmoded.

While educational innovation of any kind is difficult, career ladder and teacher evaluation designs are unusually challenging. The time available for change in these two complex systems is short. Legislative initiative calls for results in a short time. Public attention and support are likely to fade. Teacher resistance is another complicating factor. The current professional culture is not accepting to change in teacher evaluation and reward structures (Lortie, 1975; Wolf, 1971).

The career ladder design described in this report is complex. It would take three to five years to install. It presents a number of innovations, for example, excellent teaching is recognized in a variety of forms. It improves existing tools, e.g. student reports. The design uses lines of evidence which other systems neglect, such as pupil gain and parent input. It addresses the "all or nothing" problems of mandatory evidence systems, such as whether or not to require all teachers to take standardized tests, by emphasizing teacher decision making.

This report begins with a description of the career ladder structure. It then describes teacher evaluation and decision making systems. It concludes with a description of evaluation procedures. The Appendices include issues about the lines of evidence, evaluation forms, critiques of the system by outside audiences, and a bibliography of resources used in the design.

CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

This section describes a teacher career ladder system which was designed to recognize excellence through a series of promotions. Teachers present a professional dossier documenting their work to a District panel of teachers, administrators, and community representatives. The career ladder structure consists of, a "mainline" series of teacher ranks and a more temporary "sideline" of one additional duty rank. Teacher leadership is provided for by the Additional Service Teacher rank and Senior Teacher status.

Fulltime beginning teachers start in the Certified Teacher rank. The rank of Associate Teacher requires one panel review, while promotion to Master Teacher and Senior Teacher require two and three subsequent additional reviews respectively. Gathering data for a review normally requires two years. Promotion includes a considerable increase in salary. There are no quotas for advancement on the mainline ladder. Promotion is based on quality classroom performance, and is not a system of additional pay for additional work.

SENIOR TEACHER

MASTER TEACHER ADDITIONAL SERVICE TEACHER

ASSOCIATE TEACHER

CERTIFIED TEACHER

LIMITED SERVICE TEACHER

PARAPROFESSIONAL

Fig. 1: Career Ladder Structure

Limited Service Teachers and Paraprofessionals implement and support instruction. They function under direction of teachers in the top three ranks. They are hired, assigned, and evaluated by teachers in the top two ranks.

Additional Service Teachers come from the top three ranks. They perform additional district leadership or development duties. The AST rank is achieved by merit review and proposal; it carries an additional stipend and has a normal duration of one to two years. On occasion, the AST rank is given for outstanding reviews by the promotion panel; in this case no additional duties are prescribed. The AST rank has quotas.

NOTES ON LADDER RUNG POSITIONS

1. Paraprofessionals Non-certificated; assigned and supervised by Senior and Master Teachers. May also work under Associate Teachers. Sample tasks include: reading and responding to student papers, monitoring large or small instructional groups, operating instructional media (including computers), and preparing materials. Hourly pay.

2. Limited Service Teachers Certified, but who choose to work as substitutes or part-time teachers. Part-time may include full day for part of the year, or part of the day or week. Assigned and evaluated by Senior and Master Teachers. May work under the direct supervision of Associate Teachers.

3. Certified Teachers New teachers before their first review, or teachers under remediation. Monitoring consists of administrative and peer visits. Some lines of evidence may be required. Has smaller classes, visitation of outstanding teachers, mentors, support groups, special inservice, and considerations in placement and courses.

4. Associate Teacher Has completed at least one Panel review with a promotion. Responsible for managing own subsequent evaluations. Eligible for Additional Service.

5. Master Teacher Has completed at least three Panel reviews with ratings of "contributing, well functioning." Assists in management of Additional Service program, Limited Service Teachers, Paraprofessionals, support for Certified Teachers, and evaluation system. Responsible for managing own subsequent evaluations; eligible for Additional Service.

6. Senior Teacher Has completed at least four Panel reviews, with no ratings of "Deficient", and at least two of "Exemplary." Same functions and responsibilities as Master Teachers. Expected to assist in District decision making, problem solving, and direction setting.

7. Additional Service Teacher Selected by teacher dominated panel for compelling one page proposal. Term is yearly; expectation is for service for 1-2 years per application topic. Examples of proposal topics might include:

-mentor for beginning teachers
-assistance on district hiring
-curriculum or instruction problems
-community relations
-rating of "Exemplary" (no additional tasks)

The reward for this rating is money and released time. The award is more for the freshness and drive of the individual educator, and less for the particular task proposed. The purpose is more to acknowledge innovative, outstanding ideas that should

affect the system, and less to get the bureaucratic work done. The bonus may include extended year, instead of time off during the year. These spots should be rotated: teachers fill them for a year or two, then return to their original assignments.

FEATURES OF THE CAREER LADDER SYSTEM

Promotion

The career ladder system emphasizes promotions. They are awarded by a District Promotion Panel, which also conducts interim reviews. The promotion is considered to be a major decision in the life of the district and of the teacher. There are no district limits on how many teachers occupy each rank above Special Assignment. There is a fall back provision: demotion is appropriate if the teacher does not pass a rereview within five years, or if the principal calls for an interim review because of unsatisfactory yearly monitoring.

Salary Increases

The system retains yearly increments, but they are greatly reduced. Promotions are accompanied by major increments so that the pay differential among ranks is considerable.

Mandatory Provisions for Some Ranks

The top and bottom ranks may have certain lines of evidence which are required for promotion. Ranks in the middle are more open. The rank of Senior teacher requires at least one review of "Exemplary...."

Perquisites and Responsibilities of Top Ranks

The top ranks (Master, Senior) enjoy professional privileges which are new to the system. These include supervision of lowest ranks, additional input in hiring and firing. The goal is increased responsibility and authority beyond that given to teachers today. These teachers bear responsibility not only for themselves and their classrooms, but for the professional health of the district.

There is an important distinction between professional <u>responsibilities</u> and <u>tasks</u>. Responsibilities may be delegated as specific tasks. While upper rank teachers are expected to be responsible for such things as beginning teacher socialization and teacher evaluation quality, this does <u>not</u> mean that they must serve on committees, leave the classroom to carry out the tasks, or finance the activities. It means that over a period of time they should see that the tasks are addressed.

Monitoring, Review, Demotion Procedures

The promotion system requires considerable time over which data are gathered. During this time principals are expected to continue their monitoring functions--brief class visits, teacher conversations, attention to hearsay--which can flag poor practice. Retention procedures in the District will operate much as in prior practice. In addition, promoted teachers will be required to

submit to Promotion Panel review at least once every five years for either (a) additional promotions, or (b) review of current status in order to retain rank. If the Panel finds that the teacher has not maintained performance commensurate with their promotion, they will recommend demotion and, in serious cases, remediation.

DECISION MAKING

Who Decides?

Promotion decisions will be made by a District panel based on objective evidence in individual teacher dossiers. The dossier presents the teacher's best case for the value of their work. The evidence should pertain to the quality of teaching, the quantity of learning, professionalism, and ethicality. While there are not perfect measures of these elements, there certainly is evidence which can provide a satisfactory estimate for purposes of promotion. It is the professional responsibility of each teacher to construct the dossier, and of the District to assist in this process.

The Promotion Panel consists of four teachers, two administrators, and two community representatives. Five votes are necessary for promotion.

Based on What?

The dossier on which teachers will be judged has the following contents and characteristics (Peterson, 1984):

1. It should contain credible and reliable evidence. Data collected in a safe manner (e.g., outside person collects and scores student questionnaires).

2. Evidence will be from a variety of lines. No one line is satisfactory for all teachers; no one line is compelling and complete enough to serve by itself as a complete indicator of teacher quality.

3. Teachers have control over contents. They see the evidence before it is entered, and make decisions about what is included. It is their best case.

4. The contents of different dossiers varies. Best cases of teaching excellence are presented. Quality teaching comes in a variety of forms.

How Reported?

The current practice of categorizing teachers as satisfactory or unsatisfactory is improved with a restructuring of possible summative outcomes. The three new categories are:

Contributing, well functioning.
Exemplary, in these respects....
Unsatisfactory, in these respects....

The majority of teachers will be placed in the first category, an appropriate description of general practice. Where there is reliable evidence for extraordinary practice, the second category will specify its presence. A rating in the third category also will specify the exception(s) to general practice. In addition, a third category rating will place the person in Remediation from which the next serious review must find a rating in the first two categories, or begin termination procedures.

When?

Time is an important consideration in the design and function of a teacher evaluation procedure. Serious review takes several years to prepare. It should be done at least once before "permanent" hiring is done. It should be done perhaps 3 to 4 times (6-12 years) before upper ladder rungs are achieved. Once a teacher has gained status, reviews continue. An inadequate review can result in a demotion in rank.

Teacher Oversight Group

One teacher from each school serves on the Teacher Oversight Committee. This body has a variety of functions in support of the evaluation system. They act as ombudspersons for candidate teachers, with tasks of providing information and checking the fair operation of the system. In addition, they monitor the quality of the evaluation system itself:

-are the data gathering procedures available, reliable, valid, credible, and fairly used?
-are data gathered and stored appropriately?
-is information available to teacher candidates?
-is there appropriate confidentiality and appropriate openness for credibility?
-is the system operated fairly?

The Oversight Committee also has the duty of advising the Promotion Panel on difficult cases; including, presumably the Unsatisfactory... and Exemplary... cases. The major function of the Committee is to open up scrutiny applied to decision making, add a professional perspective, maintain the quality of the evaluation system, and be advocates for quality evaluation in the district and profession.

Appeals Procedures

The applicant for promotion may appeal a decision of the Promotion Panel. The appeal procedure will follow a series of steps.

The basis for appeal can be for substantive or procedural reasons. Substantive grounds are that the process or materials were not valid, objective or reasonable. Procedural grounds could be one or more of the following: (A) procedures did not follow specifications, (B) reasons for non-promotion provided by the panel contained errors of fact, or (C) that individual Panel

members misacted. The decisions themselves are considered to be discretionary acts, and generally not appealable.

Steps

1. Confer with the Oversight member at the school for clarification of the process and basis for the appeal. Applicant may have a representative attend any stage of appeal. Applicant decides whether or not to continue with appeal.

2. Three Oversight members meet as a committee with the applicant, who presents case. New materials are not to be added to dossier; additional considerations must pertain only to the grounds for appeal. After discussing issues, members decide whether or not there is a reasonable question or doubt for appeal. Two votes are required on a secret ballot to pass the matter on to Promotion Panel. Oversight committee will prepare a written statement of the grounds for rereview.

3. Rereview by full Panel, if recommended by Oversight Committee. Action for finding of lack of due process or error of fact will be a rereview with the error remediated. Action for Panel member misaction will be a rereview without that member's participation.

4. Further appeals will follow District grievance guidelines (see District settlement).

COSTS

The costs of the system should begin somewhat below 15% of new money allocated for teacher incentives and career ladders. This is needed to develop techniques, provide for teacher released time, staff support, consultations, and testing materials. Costs should drop as the program develops.

DISTRICT SUPPORT PROVISIONS

While teachers should be expected to take leadership in their own professional evaluation activities, school districts need to provide the necessary support provisions to enable quality evaluation. The obligations are mutual.

1. Visible, rigorous administrator evaluation
2. Technical advice and assistance
3. Evaluation data staff and facilities
4. High quality substitutes
5. Beginning teacher support groups
6. Visitation programs for teachers with exemplary features
7. Plan for maintaining favorable district climate for evaluation
8. Inservice in teacher evaluation
9. Training, consultants for administrators in teacher evaluation

10. High quality testing program
11. Community information, participation program

CHANGE OVER TO NEW SYSTEM FOR THE FIRST YEAR

The Career Ladder design in its mature form should take four to five years to install. Clearly the first several years of operation will be transitional. Fairness, equity, and needs to develop new systems require time. Evidence which documents the value of teacher performance requires time. In addition, it is expected that the first year of experience will result in new features to be added to those above.

Teachers already in the District will begin the year in Professional Teacher status. They will have the opportunity to gather evidence and to apply for promotion to Associate Teacher status during the second half of the year. These reviews will be special, this-year-only, abbreviated reviews following the conventional procedures, but with the recognition of time and transition limitations. Once status has been achieved, the promotion pay differential will begin.

All teachers currently in the District are eligible, for the first year only, to apply for Additional Service Teacher projects.

Teachers beginning in the District will be subject to all features of the described Career Ladder procedures.

DOSSIERS FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

In the teacher dossier system, teachers assemble evidence for their own best case about quality, merit, value, and impact to the school system. This teacher evaluation strategy is different from other more common systems which compare each teacher with an abstract ideal set of performance or characteristics criteria. The dossier system focuses on what a teacher actually does, rather than to examine conformity with an ideal that educators and laypersons alike have difficulty agreeing upon. However, a dossier system means that individual teachers must be more responsible, thoughtful, and active in their own professional evaluation than most are accustomed to at present (Peterson, 1984).

A teacher dossier contains documentation that a teacher has performed well and has professional resources which suggest they are able to perform well in a variety of school settings. An individual dossier will contain a number of "lines of evidence" which reflect the actual performance and merit of that particular teacher. Dossiers are not expected to be uniform in contents or organization. The dossiers should be useable by colleagues, which means compression (summarization) of evidence, and data and presentations which are not overwhelming in length and bulk. A pertinent, well written and documented dossier of 20 pages is more

compelling than 400 pages of unclear scribblings and two motley boxes of student work. Whether or not the contents of a particular dossier suggest well functioning competence is a matter for professional judgment to decide.

Judgments about the quality or adequacy of a teacher dossier should be made by a panel dominated by peers, but including administrators or other participants. The criterion for review is: "has the teacher given compelling evidence of quality of performance and professional resources such that acknowledgement is warranted?" Compelling means that the case speaks for itself, and does not leave doubt. While judgments are somewhat influenced by knowledge of what other teachers have presented, individual teacher decisions should not be competitive or limited by quotas. However, the promotion process itself can be evaluated by its ability to discriminate among dossiers, and not to reward those which show inadequate evidence of teacher quality.

Teacher dossiers should be begun early in a teacher's career and given critical advice as they are developed. Not all evidence collected by teachers will be equally compelling for judgment purposes. The dossier system assumes that teachers: (a) choose their own lines of evidence, (b) receive technical advice on using each line, (c) follow accepted practice in using the lines, and (d) see results before deciding on including them in the dossier.

LINES OF EVIDENCE

A line of evidence is documentation of teacher quality in one part of their work or from one perspective, e.g., student report, peer review, or parent survey. Dossiers should contain a number of lines of evidence about teacher quality, however no single line of evidence (or even combination) is clearly appropriate or sufficient to work for <u>every</u> teacher. Also, each line is <u>not</u> appropriate or pertinent for <u>some</u> teachers in the Distict. Thus, each teacher will have to make decisions about which (and how many) lines to include in their dossier. The following lines of evidence have demonstrated good potential for documenting teacher quality (of course, dossiers can contain additional evidence which is unique to individual teachers and not included in this list):

Student Report
Peer Review of Materials
Parent Survey
Administrator Report
Professionalism
Teacher Tests
Student Achievement
Special Service
Systematic Observation
Other

DECISION MAKING

Evaluation is the gathering and compression of data to make judgments about quality, worth, merit, and impact in relation to demonstrated student and District needs. Judgments about teachers that lead to decisions require as much understanding and care as does the gathering of data. Teacher evaluation decision-making should not be done arbitrarily and capriciously. Teacher evaluation is done well when it is based on the best objective evidence available, attends to bias, and incorporates the perspectives of those affected by the performance or the evaluation itself.

The focus of decision-making, teacher quality, is a complex phenomenon. Good teaching is expressed in a variety of forms. Also, the quality of teaching is context dependent, i.e., its value is relative to the conditions and needs where performed. In addition, teacher value is in relation to specific audiences. Fourth, it may be understood in terms of <u>outcome</u> (pupil achievement), <u>process</u> (how a teacher works or what they provide), or <u>potential</u> (teacher resources). The priority of these three dimensions is generally given in this order, but individual cases will vary according to what evidence is available.

The decision question for teacher evaluation is "does the case (dossier) presented contain sufficient and compelling evidence that the teacher is well functioning and contributing such that recognition (promotion) is warranted?" Three possible findings are: "Yes," "No," and "Yes--with recognition of specific exemplary practices." The finding of <u>Yes</u> means that the teacher functions with professional practice beyond minimal expectations. It means evidence of self regulation, growth, judgment, effectiveness with students, met needs, and resources for the challenges of the educational setting. It includes ethics without question.

Comparing the evidence of various teachers may be helpful in understanding individual cases, however the decision making task is not one of ranking the dossiers. Each presentation must be looked at for its own merit.

In the dossier system of teacher evaluation, data gathering and compression are largely the responsibility of the teacher. Technical assistance in the form of advice and good examples should be provided to teachers. It is the responsibility of the Promotion Panel to examine the credibility and credentials of the presented data, as well as to decide their worth.

LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

The lines of evidence must be carefully selected by teachers to be pertinent, accurate, and credible. Each line must be used well. No one line will be appropriate for every teacher.

Guidelines for Using the Lines of Evidence

1. Student Report

A. Items recommended for use in student reports are of two kinds: opportunity to learn and global items. Opportunity to learn encompasses teacher actions and behaviors which enable student learning. These are related to active teaching behaviors, use of time, direct and indirect instruction, and equal opportunity to learn. They are not tied to particular styles; opportunity to learn may be achieved with a variety of approaches.

B. Score on student report may be a class average of the global item (e.g., "this is a good teacher"), or an average of opportunity to, learn items.

C. The reporting reliability of student forms is crucial. Stability in reporting forms requires multiple classes. Get reporting reliability: 3-5 classes, outside collector.

D. Formative items can be added, for teacher's use only, if the form does not become too long (say, >20 items, one page).

E. K-3 (nonreaders) can reliably report, but need special provisions like faces, simple items. Older students can use 1-5 or 1-7 scales.

2. Peer Review

A. Peers should be selected at the same grade level for elementary, same subject area for secondary. Three peers minimally on a review panel. Participants (ideally) should know the circumstances of a school site, but not be acquainted with person under review. In more common practice a combination of teachers at the same school and outsiders can be used.

B. Avoid classroom visits except to see facilities.

C. Review of materials may include instructional materials, student work samples, tests, achievement data, feedback samples, and grades and other record keeping.

3. Pupil Gain

A. Limit to where good tests are available, tests agreed upon, agreed upon goals, controlled administration, pre- and post-tests.

B. Multiple courses, classes considered (patterns needed)

C. Use adjusted gains (gain adjusted for prior achievement)

D. Limit to teachers at the top of consistent, above expectation. Perhaps 20-40% of teachers in district.

E. More teachers can be addressed indirectly with peer review of gains, perhaps up to 60% of teachers in district.

F. Avoid post- only, teacher administered, narrow topic

4. Parent Survey

A. Adequate sampling: minimum 65% of return, in 3-5 classes

B. Avoid topics for which teachers are not recruited, trained

C. Good topics include information about class and objectives, data on student ability and performance, and ideas for home support of learning.

5. Systematic Observation

A. Limited to several times in career (e.g., 2nd year, 7th, 15th)

B. Limited topics possible: opportunity to learn, equal opportunity to learn (sex, ability, achievement, ethnicity), use of time, bimodal instruction

C. Access to inservice, examples, practice

D. Observers must be independent, trained, monitored. Observation topics should be narrow and have a verifiable recording system. Reliable sampling may call for as many as eight observation periods.

6. Special Service

A. Special services are teacher contributions beyond those generally required for professionalism. Should have a scale of impact beyond individual classrooms, usually affecting the learning of groups of students or work of a number of teachers.

B. The value of the special service claimed by the teacher should be understood in relation to district needs. Thus, a needs analysis which reflects a variety of situations and their priority is required.

C. Corroborating persons should be in a position to judge the particular area of service in relation to other areas--they should not solely be advocates of the area of service.

7. Teacher tests

A. Should specify type of teacher test: academic aptitude, basic academic skills, subject matter knowledge, or professional knowledge.

B. Elementary level teachers usually present a combination of subject matter areas, for example, social studies, mathematics, language arts, and science. General knowledge tests (e.g., NTE's General Knowledge Test) are appropriate for this level.

Subject matter knowledge tests for secondary teachers usually are more specialized, for example, Life Science or Social Studies.

Both kinds of subject matter tests essentially are achievement tests. Since factual and conceptual learning may be forgotten, retesting at some interval (say, ten years) may be called for.

8. Professionalism

A. Professionalism includes evidence of up to date practice, self-regulation, support for colleagues, maintenance and improvement of skills, initiative, and responsibility for educational problems outside of the classroom.

B. Lists of activities, visits, and contacts are helpful; they should be corroborated by letters, programs, expanded descriptions which can be included in a supporting folder (not necessarily the primary dossier).

9. Administrator report

A. Administrator report may be a copy of the conventional district form or a specialized limited report form (the latter is included in the UTEP form collection). The limited form does not include items requiring reliable systematic observation, but depends on more global estimates created with hearsay, informal sampling, and general comparisons with other teachers. The global nature of these reports makes them defensible.

10. Other

A. Teachers are encouraged to conceptualize contributions not dealt with in the above nine lines of evidence. This includes brief descriptions of the nature of the performance, a needs analysis to give perspective of the contribution in the district, documentation of events, evidence of outcomes, and statements of persons who corroborate the teacher claims.

APPENDIX A

ISSUES CONCERNING LINES OF EVIDENCE FOR TEACHER EVALUATION

1. Student Report

Students are familiar with the work of teachers--few other concerned persons spend the time with teachers that students do. Second, it is in the direct interest of students to have good teaching. Next, pupils are well aware of their own case. Averages of groups of students are stable measures. Finally, student reports are inexpensive and can show high internal reliability if items are carefully selected.

Inadequate sampling of classes over time causes unreliability. Rating form systems can become popularity contests, and encourage teacher pandering to students. Students have a different viewpoint of the classroom than other audiences. Many indefensible items often are used in pupil reports. Students are not able to accurately make some judgments about the classroom, for example, fairness. Teachers are quite wary of student reports.

2. Peer Review

Arguments for peer review are that: only practicing teachers can make certain judgments about each other (e.g., quality of curriculum given actual resources, problems, and student abilities), teacher viewpoints are needed in school politics, and professionalism requires certain levels of peer judgments--certainly more than presently exists.

Peer evaluation can threaten working relationships within schools, can be based on friendships and politics as well as quality performance, and suffer the same unreliability of any brief classroom visits. It also can be maintained than since administrators hire and supervise teachers, administrators should evaluate them. Good teachers should be kept in the classroom, and not given administrative duties.

3. Pupil Gain

Pupil achievement is perhaps the most compelling evidence of teacher quality--after all, (the argument goes) isn't this what teaching is all about? It is true that questions about style, background, and personality are barely relevent when it can be demonstrated that students are learning well. A quality teacher evaluation system must have some provisions for using pupil gain data when they are available.

The main argument against using pupil gain data is that it is very difficult to actually get good measures or estimates of student learning that can be attributed to teacher effects. Certainly, prior student achievement must be taken into account.

Good pupil tests for teacher evaluation purposes, defensible test administrations, and pretests are practically non-existent. Pupil achievement data can distort practice. Finally, the use of standardized tests for teacher evaluation can damage their important use for curriculum evaluation and individual student diagnosis. Teachers are opposed to using achievement data for teacher evaluation.

4. Administrator Report

Principals are in a good position to see many teachers, know the needs of the school, interact with parents and staff--as well as students and teachers. Thus the opinion of administrators on teacher quality is a valuable resource. Principals are demonstrably accurate reporters of general class progress and classroom order. Administrators are responsible for school conduct. Part of their job description is to be an instructional leader. Principal evaluation is a long accepted practice.

Principals face conflict in their dual role as leader and evaluator. Teacher credibility of administrator report is not high. Principals are demonstrably poor judges of teacher knowledge, effective behavior, and particular strategies. The politics and sociology of the school workplace contribute to make principal judgments inaccurate. Principals have many demands which compete with evaluation. They are not necessarily hired because of teaching expertise or ability to evaluate teachers.

5. Parent Survey

Parent confidence in schools and teacher performance is a key to good schools. Current politics of educational decision making emphasize consumer reaction. Parents know many of their children's educational needs. Communication with parents is a part of a teacher's job. Parent surveys can be inexpensive.

Parent expertise on teaching practice may be quite limited. They have biases toward seeing their children as individuals when teachers need to see them as members of a group. Even a few parents can bring extreme, distorting pressure on teachers.

6. Professionalism

The total teacher performance assumes that teachers are up to date, supportive of good practice of their colleagues, assume responsibility for situations outside of their classrooms. Training, other experiences, interaction with colleagues all can contribute to more valuable classroom practice as well as define teaching excellence. While much that constitutes teaching quality is difficult to document, professionalism is relatively simple.

The main teacher activity is in the classroom. Mere totals of outside experience do not necessarily contribute to teaching effectiveness. Preparation for teaching is not as important as

the teaching itself. In the absence of quality performance, professionalism itself is not very valuable. Many teachers actually work as semi-professionals.

7. Teacher Tests

Teachers must first of all know their what it is they teach. Low levels of teacher knowledge end all question of teacher quality. Students should be protected from teachers who lack knowledge. In addition to needing to know subject matter, teachers should be adept at basic communication skills. They interact with students, colleagues and parents. They are role models for students. Professional knowledge of students, curriculum and instructional practice can reflect teaching quality. Some teachers are effective because of high levels of verbal knowledge.

Teacher knowledge does not guarantee that teachers can communicate what they know. Present teacher tests have limitations and inadequacies. Much of what is important about teaching cannot be measured with paper-pencil, mutliple choice tests. Some very good teachers do not do well on teacher tests. Test taking ability fades for many once they leave the college enviornoment.

8. Systematic Observation

A reliable look at teachers actually working with students is an essential part of understanding their value. While much of student learning is not clearly visible, what a teacher does is quite apparent. Current research has established a number of guidelines for teacher practice which often is correlated with student learning. Basic issues of fairness, communication ability, and opportunity to learn are apparent in observing classes.

Good quality, reliable observation data are expensive to obtain. They require independent perspectives. Teachers need additional training to fairly prepare for observational evaluation. Classroom observation can be disruptive. Knowledge about "effective teaching" is merely correlational, and no guarantee that alternative (even contradictory) strategies are not inferior in every case. Observers need training, monitoring, and are limited in their scope of attention.

Excluded Lines of Evidence

A variety of possible lines of evidence have been considered for the Park City system and have been excluded because of inherent difficulties which have not been overcome. There is a need to continue to explore these lines and to search for still others. The following discussions will present only the problems with each potential line.

APPENDIX A

1. Self report Teacher self reports are inaccurately high. In addition, they create a conflict of interest between the interests of the individual teacher and the interests of clients and the educational organization. They tend to reward unrealistic appraisals.

2. Graduate followups It is difficult to get good samples of students even several years after the classroom experience; most studies of this type are able to assemble a small number of the students. The effects of intervening variables are difficult to separate out.

3. Teacher performance tests Standardized classes, goals, and test situations are too expensive to get satisfactory reliability.

4. Teacher competency assessment Mere possession of minimal teaching capacities does not guarantee appropriate use of them. Universal descriptions of teaching competencies have not been accepted.

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATOR REPORT OF TEACHER FORM

Check sources of information used for judgments:

__ discussions with teacher
__ discussions with other teachers
__ discussions with chairperson or teacher leader
__ discussions with students
__ discussions with parents
__ brief classroom visits (number _____)
__ evidence presented by teacher
__ student achievement data
__ district level information
__ other (specify _____)

	Exemplary		Contributing, well functioning			Unsatisfactory	
Overall rating	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Classroom order	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Classroom progress	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Member school community	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Maintains Health & Safety Conditions	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Follows District & state guidelines: Yes Needs attention No

Ethics: Yes No

Signed _____

Date _____

(Regular District rating form may be included in support folder or appended)

APPENDIX B

PARENT SURVEY

Teacher:

For each of the following information items, indicate if you requested, and if the teacher provided the item (whether or not you requested it).

		Requested by parent	Provided by teacher-whether requested or not
1.	Overview of class content and goals	_____	_____
2.	Description of student's progress	_____	_____
3.	Description of student's academic ability	_____	_____
4.	Ideas for home support of learning	_____	_____

For each of the following, circle the number that describes your opinion.

	Yes				No	Don't Know
5. Did your child seem to know what was expected of her or him in this class?	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Did the classroom work seem to be the right challenge, not too hard or too easy?	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. Are you satisfied with your daughter or son's overall classroom experience?	1	2	3	4	5	0

COMMENTS FOR TEACHER (and for promotion panel if teacher chooses):

APPENDIX B

CUESTIONARIO DE PADRES

MAESTRO_____

Circule el numero que describa su opinion en cada una de las siguientes preguntas, por favor.

	Si	Casi siempre	Algunas veces	Casi nunca	No
1. Sabia su hijo og que se esperaba de el½ella?	1	2	3	4	5
2. El trabajo en las clases fue adecuado, no muy dificil o muy facil?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Esta usted satisfecho con las experiencias que sum hija½hijo tuvo in las clases?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Esta usted satisfecho con los metodos que los maestros utilizaron con la conducta de los ninos?	1	2	3	4	5
5. La tarea que ss les dio fue adecuada, no demaciado facil o demaciado difficil?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Esta usted satisfecho con la manera en que se condujeron las conferencias de padres y maestros?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Le parece a usted que se le mantuvo informado del progreso academico de su hijo½hija?	1	2	3	4	5

PEER REVIEW

Step One: Teacher Assembles Evidence for Review (may include):

overview of instructional plan	texts, workbooks
examples of student work	tests, quizzes
sample instructional materials	lesson & unit plans
pre- and post-tests, student gain data	media lists, references
diagrams, photos of room	assignments
assigned readings, supplements	student projects
grades, evaluation records & reports	letters to parents
fieldtrip reports	student records

sample feedback to 10 students on extended assignment, written half page

Step Two: Peer Panel Reviews Evidence

Panel consists of three teachers at same grade (elementary) or subject area (secondary). Panel should be aware of challenges, resources, and actual problems of the teacher's setting, but as far removed as possible in terms of personal relations, program politics, and school assignments.

Panel discusses the following questions in relation to materials:

"Is there evidence of:

1. Appropriate challenge, difficulty for these students?
2. Quality curriculum--up to date, relevent, complete?
3. Useful feedback to students?
4. Defensible gains, student achievement?
5. Grades (other reports) which are fair and defensible?
6. Consistency with state and District guidelines?"

Step Three: Panel Reports Out One of the Following:

"This is a contributing, well functioning teacher."
"This is a contributing, well functioning teacher--and exemplary in these respects...." (Specify)
"This teacher is deficient in these respects...." (Specify)

They do not report out conclusions to particular review questions, except in formative feedback to teacher, if arranged.

PROFESSIONALISM

We say that a teacher is a good professional when they do things like the following:

> they are self-critical about their practice, they evaluate their teaching objectively and systematically, their practice is improving, they give and get advice from colleagues, they are up-to-date, concern about quality is evident, they think about the implications of their work, intiative is taken to get the best instruction and curriculum, colleagues are supported in good practice, and they take responsibility for educational concerns outside of the classroom.

A teacher does not have to do all the above to be considered professional, but to exhibit substantial and significant activity in this direction.

Evidence for desireable professionalism may consist of documenting small scale instructional variations tried out in classes, professional visits with other teachers, completion of inservice courses or degree programs, participation in professional groups, support activities for other teachers, or many other specific indicators.

Up to date teaching can be documented by briefly presenting (a) what the practice or content is, (b) some corroboration that other educators see this to be valuable practice or content, (c) evidence that the practice was carried out or content implemented, and (d) that it made a significant educational difference to students.

* * * * * * *

Evidence for Professionalism should be limited to two typed pages. Supporting materials (transcripts, articles, instructional descriptions, corroborating letters, curriculum examples, lists of names and places) should be kept in the dossier support folder.

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT

Evidence for good teaching in relation to pupil achievement should address the following concerns:

1. What has been learned
   - A. The difference between where students began and ended (pre-instruction and post-instruction measures)
   - B. Educational importance (not just scores, what are pupils now able to do and what is the significance to them)
2. What is the quality of the measures of achievement (validity and reliability of assessments)
3. How does this achievement compare with
   - A. Local expectations and requirements
   - B. What students of similar pretest scores achieve
   - C. What teachers with similar resources (time, materials, student characteristics) get
   - D. Other desireable educational gains for these students
   - E. What a good textbook or workbook would have achieved?
4. What positive and negative side-effects were associated with this learning?

In practice, it has been extremely difficult to get data this good. The best advice is for teachers to address as many of these concerns as possible, and to allow consideration of this limitation during the judgment process. With experience and examples many of the above questions can be provided for.

* * * * *

Evidence for pupil achievement for the teacher dossier should be compressed to not more than two pages. Support material (lists of scores, test samples, requirement statements, etc.) should be placed in the dossier support folder.

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL SERVICE DOCUMENTATION

(Use spaces directly and briefly; append expanded support material)

1. What District need did you address?

2. What is the educational magnitude of the need (i.e., numbers of students involved, educational importance to them)?

3. What is the priority of the need to the district and society (what needs are of lower and higher priority)?

4. Name, title, signature of two persons who corroborate items 1-3.

5. What provisions did you make to meet the need?

6. What evidence is there that need was met?

7. Name, title, signature of two persons who corroborate items 5-6.

APPENDIX B

STUDENT REPORT ITEMS

Middle School-High School Version

		AGREE						DISAGREE
1.	I know what I am supposed to do in class	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Teacher shows us how to do new things							
3.	I have enough time to finish my class work							
4.	Class is too noisy and rowdy for learning							
5.	I learn new things I can tell you about							
6.	I know how well I am doing in class							
7.	This is a good teacher							
8.	We have materials and supplies to learn with							
9.	I can do the work in class							
10.	I know why we learn what we learn in class							
11.	Class is too slow or too fast to learn well							
12.	The rules in class help us to learn							
13.	Teacher is too unkind or unfair for me to learn							

Upper Grade (3-6) Version

		AGREE					DISAGREE
1.	I know what I am supposed to do in class	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	Teacher shows us how to do new things						
3.	I have enough time to finish my class work						
4.	Class is too noisy and rowdy for learning						
5.	I learn new things I can tell you about						
6.	This is a good teacher						
7.	We have materials and supplies to learn with						
8.	I can do the work in class						
9.	Class is too slow or too fast to learn well						
10.	The rules in class help us to learn						
11.	Teacher is too unkind or unfair for me to learn						

Prereader (K-2) Version *

		YES	SOMETIMES	NO
1.	I know what I am supposed to do in class			
2.	Teacher shows us how to do new things			
3.	I have enough time to finish my class work			
4.	Class is too noisy and rowdy for learning			
5.	I learn new things in this class			
6.	My teacher is a good teacher			
7.	Teacher is kind and friendly			
8.	We have plenty of papers, pencils, books and worksheets			
9.	I can do the work in class			
10.	The rules in class help us to learn			

*Each item on different colored paper sheet

TEACHER TESTS

Teacher tests are a variety of objective measures of teacher knowledge. One test type is knowledge of subject matter content, at the generalist level for elementary teachers and at the specialist level for secondary teachers. A second kind of teacher test pertains to knowledge of basic academic skills such as reading comprehension, writing, and listening. A third type of test is of professional knowledge, such as instructional strategies, child development, and legal requirements of teachers. A final test type is academic aptitude which pertains to abilities to perform tasks such as seeing patterns in data, identification of similarities, reasoning, and verbal representation of ideas.

Examples of teacher tests include:

Subject matter knowledge:
- Generalist--
  - National Teachers' Exam (NTE) General Knowledge
- Specialist--
  - NTE Specialty Area Tests, Graduate Record Exam Area

Basic Skills Tests: NTE Basic Skills Test

Professional Knowledge: NTE Professional Knowledge
GRE Area Test in Education

Academic Aptitude: GRE, School & College Aptitude Test, Miller's Analogies Test

TYPE OF TEST	NAME OF TEST	DATE TAKEN	STANDARD SCORE	%ILE	NORM GROUP

APPENDIX C

DESIGN COMMENTS OF EXTERNAL AUDIENCES

Introduction

This appendix describes comments by reviewers associated with seven Utah agencies as they examined the first career ladder design. The final design, presented in the main text of this report, incorporates most of the ideas generated by these critics. Examples of alterations in the original plan which resulted from this process include procedures for demotion, appeal provisions, Promotion Panel membership, new items in several instruments, and clarification of many descriptions. Opinions of the reviewers do not necessarily represent the official views of their respective agencies, and no endorsements are implied by their comments.

Utah State Legislative Research Analyst's Office
Utah Parent-Teachers' Association
Governor Matheson's Education Policy Advisor's Office
Utah Education Association
Rowland Hall-St. Mark's School (private)
League of Women Voters, Salt Lake
Utah Principals' Society

FIGURE C-1: Reviewing Agencies

The following persons contributed a great deal to this planning process by organizing reviewer meetings and providing input from their agencies: Lowell Baum, Ivan Cendese, Betty Condon, Donna Davies, Anna Marie Dunlap, Tom Jackson, Wayne Lewis, Jean Weston, and Jim Wilson. Many thanks are due for their efforts and contributions.

Reviewers were given seven page descriptions of the original design one to two weeks before a meeting was scheduled to hear their reactions. Agency representation ranged from one to eleven persons. Interviewers solicited comments, suggestions, and advice about career ladder planning in one to one and a half hour meetings with each group.

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH ANALYST'S OFFICE

Members of this group began by emphasizing the reality of a short-range perspective implicit in much Legislative action, a situation which results from dealing with pressing issues of here and now facing the diverse group of persons making up the Legislature. It is the role of other agencies in the society, such as the universities, to work with long-range objectives. Even with this perspective, it is clear that implementation of a career ladder system will necessarily span several years before an

accurate assessment of results can be made. Legislatively, this poses several problems, the most immediate is funding. There is an important question about the source of dollars to finance the long range project suggested in the career ladder design under review. Although legislators tend to be sympathetic to educational needs, their first concern will be with funding commitments. As one reviewer said, "If evaluation is going to be an honest effort, it's going to cost money. In the long run it will be very expensive. If it's going to be successful, long range funding must be addressed [in the design]."

Along with a long range financing plan, the reviewers recommended attention to a more detailed plan for phasing in the career ladder system. Timelines and concise year-to-year outlines of activities would be very helpful in improving the plan and communicating it to others.

The reviewers generally felt that the career ladder design would make the teaching profession more attractive to a diverse range of potential teachers. They anticipate, however, a very emotional response to the "concept" of teacher evaluation. One important issue is that of professionalism. Legislators generally view teachers as professionals, yet when comparing teachers with other professionals, such as doctors, dentists, and attorneys, "it is like two different animals." The former are evaluated by their clientele in the form of returned business. Teachers' clientele are a captive audience and do not have selective choice. While there is agreement that teachrs should enjoy a great deal of autonomy in their practice, there is a requirement for a different kind of professional evaluation because of the limitations of the clientele choice. This represents a difficult situation, one that will be difficult to resolve to everyone's satisfaction.

The reviewers addressed a number of other issues raised by the career ladder design which they expected to cause difficulty in implementation. "Evaluation is as an emotional an issue as student busing for racial balancing." Teachers seem quite cynical about evaluation from their past experience. "Teachers have a hard time believing it's for their benefit or good. It will be hard to convince them. Teachers are naturally afraid of being washed out, especially if it's done unfairly." Another problem is one of quotas for success in evaluation plans. It is recognized that quotas are generally not desireable, but the idea of them works well for legislators.

Another emotional response that could be expected from some audiences of the teaching profession stems from the commonly-held perspective that teachers are paid less than other professions because they work "part-time." This idea may cause resistance to plans for higher pay, even merit pay systems. Eleven month contracts may make more sense to critics than paying teachers more for their current "abbreviated" work year. Yet there is considerable public opinion that teachers should be paid for classroom teaching, and not for planning, observing, and preparing

materials. In general, however, legislators feel that additional salary for teachers is desireable, that teachers should be rewarded for excellence in the classroom, and providing some projects for additional pay could help to counter negative sentiment.

Some discussion focused on the idea of merit steps for teachers. On one hand, it was seen as positive because it provides an opportunity for teacher to "go somewhere." On the other, a question is raised about an undesireable side effect: cooperative sharing or competition? Obviously, cooperation is essential in teaching, but it could be deterred through the very realistic possibility of teachers becoming competitive, vying for promotion, and thus isolating themselves in their own classrooms. "Career ladders should promote excellence, not create new divisions."

Several logistical recommendations were made for the career ladder design:

-Have a diverse group in the Promotion Panel. Using only peer teachers will likely contribute more fear and mistrust for teachers.

-A means of demotion is necessary for those who move up the ladder but do not maintain good practice. The credibility of the system to outsiders will be lessened by not having clear demotion procedures.

-Include a way of rewarding veteran teachers (ten years or more) prior to implementing the career ladder plan. These teachers are likely to resent having to prove themselves one more time.

-Validate the claims of pupil gains included in the dossier.

Finally, it was pointed out that career ladder systems have the potential of creating an interesting market for beginning teachers. Various districts would be competing for the newcomers interest. This dynamic could put pressure on districts to come up with the best designs in order to attract the best talent.

UTAH STATE PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

PTA representatives discussed many of the same concerns voiced by legislators. One isssue was that of the necessity for long term funding of the innovation of career ladders, even during their developmental phase when teacher enthusiasm might be tentative. The lack of certainty is likely to encourage many teachers to be reluctant to participate in what might turn out to be one more bandwagon.

One developmental suggestion for the specific career ladder

program design in this study was to describe the lines of evidence in considerable detail. For example, the numbers of responses required in student and parent survey forms would make a difference in their credibility and effectiveness. Also, each line will need procedures which verify the accuracy and reliability of data presented. The question of collecting data with teacher knowledge, while avoiding teacher bias and influence needs addressing. Some concern was expressed that the system emphasizes the positive side of performance, and will not allow the other side of poor practice to be satisfactorily addressed. There is the posibility that some lines may emerge as quite easy to make positive, and become the predominant source of data. Finally, the possibility of making some of the lines required should receive careful consideration.

Much discussion centered on the Promotion Panel. Reviewers strongly felt that membership should include others in addition to peer teachers. They particularly recommended that community members be included, and that one requirement for membership include status as a parent. They also said that the non-traditional (i.e., single parent) family be represented. Their recommendation for selecting Panel members was to have a committee set up through the regional PTA directors. A district career ladder committee could contact his regional PTA director who would appoint the Panel member(s). This would provide a "one-step removed" system to avoid personal vendettas of volunteer members. There was agreement that regional directors would be able to do a good joby of recommending appropriate, well qualified members.

Several logistical suggestions were made to improve the original career ladder design provided for review:

-Use an eligibility quota, only a given number of teachers should be considered for promotion each year.

-A means of demotion is necessary. Arrival at a ladder rung should not mean permanence.

-Some better, more specific means of rewarding probationary teachers is necessary. Some of the best teaching is done by beginners. If they are not rewarded they may lose interest. They often are taken advantage of in present practice.

-All educational personnel should participate in evaluation, including administrators, counselors, etc. Lines of evidence could easily be adapted to fit all educator roles.

-The Promotion Panel should report reasons for their findings, "this teacher was promoted (not promoted) because of the following reasons...."

-The design should include a program of remediation for teachers who are not promoted.

-Serious consideration should be given to including personal interviews as a part of the evaluation data.

-Observations of the classroom should be a part of evaluation.

In general, reviewers of the design saw the career ladder ideas to be a "giant step forward" for making teaching more professional, and a valuable addition to current reform activities. The design was seen as a link between teachers and the outside world, one that could reward deserving teachers. It is likely that confidence from outsiders would increase with operation of an effective evaluation system. It has the potential of elevating the lay perspective of the teaching profession.

A good evaluation system could serve to eliminate teachers who are able to "coast" in practice. It would make difficult the opportunity to stay in teaching for a free ride, with incompetent practice. It will make teachers aware that they <u>have</u> to produce, or face lack of promotion. Such a challenge may reduce the numbers of those who will enter teaching, but the standard of competence will rise. Some reviewers felt that evaluation, such as included in this design, would make education more of a free market place which "may not be the complete answer, but one which certaily has proven beneficial in other arenas."

GOVERNOR'S EDUCATION POLICY ADVISOR

A primary concern for design of a career ladder system should be financing such an innovation. These costs are not only for the main promotion rewards, but also for ancillary costs such as class size reduction for beginning teachers in the system. As with other review groups, the lack of certainty in funding continuity may serve as a deterrent to teachers as the program begins.

Careful attention must be paid to the developing concepts of additional teacher responsibilities as they move up in the career ladder. Difficulties occur whenever a teacher has to leave the classroom because of managerial duties. People have strong beliefs that teachers belong in the classroom, most especially good teachers. It is likely that the public will not accept teachers being assigned substantial duties aside from those in the classroom. Another problem that can be anticipated with development of additional teacher tasks is that criteria for good teaching and standards for additional duties may not only differ, they may at times be contradictory. Thus, the definition of excellence may become confused as the two reasons for evaluation become mixed.

Some concern was raised that the career ladder design would discriminate against teachers who are not prone to "selling"

themselves, some individuals do not like to "toot their own horn." There is a question as to whether or not the design would promote the best teachers or merely those who are most active in selling their own case.

An important language distinction was made for the term "contributing, well functioning." This term connotes "standard" and implies average performance, as distinct from excellent. Designers should consider if it is desireable to promote to senior status all teachers who are functioning well, or "at standard", or if higher standards should exist. There is a question whether or not senior teachers should be rated "exemplary" just once, as suggested in the plan, or should they regularly be seen as exemplary.

A number of logistical improvements were suggested:

-Some means for providing sabbaticals for other than senior teachers ought to be explored. This feature is important for all teachers, and not just a select few.

-A detailed appeals section should be added. Teachers turned down for promotion will need a sense of fairness and consideration.

-Specify the numbers of lines of evidence to be used in the dossier. Teachers will need more guidance, even if it comes down to providing forms to be filled out.

-Evaluation procedures earlier than the first promotion should be specified. It is not clear how beginners will be evaluated, or gradually prepared for their first major Panel review.

-Administrators should serve on the Promotion Panel. It is necessary that a manager play a strong role in any promotion decisions.

-Pay attention to the evaluation of teachers in the middle ranges of performance. It is easy to identify the top and bottom 5%; the ones in the middle are hardest to evaluate.

-Peers on the Promotion Panel should not be from the same school as the teacher being evaluated.

-Candidate teachers should not make a personal appearance before the Promotion Panel; they should be evaluated solely on dossier contents.

In general, the design looks like a positive, beneficial career ladder system which should reward members of a profession that is often neglected.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

As with other review groups, funding for implementation and continuance of a long term career ladder system is seen as a major concern for getting it started. Where the money will come from in Utah is not at all clear, but beginning the innovation will be difficult as long as people can only hope that funds will be available. Continual worry about the viability of career ladders will be detrimental to teacher morale. The financial rewards of career ladders are expected to contribute toward better teacher morale.

Attention to the plight of the new teacher was seen to be a strong feature of the design. A number of horror stories of beginning teacher treatment were related to emphasize the need to pay attention to novice teacher development and socialization.

The review group agreed that having the individual teacher responsible for the lines of evidence was a good idea, but cautioned that it may allow poor teachers to "pad" their dossier or "fake it" when assembling evidence. This would keep mediocrity in the profession. Having required lines could produce some desireable uniformity for evaluation. It was suggested that some hybrid, such as teacher choice of instruments within a given required line, might be a good idea.

Some concern was raised about the validity of some lines of evidence. For example, student reports have a long history of ambiguous and even misleading results. Care will have to be taken that each individual instrument is well developed and checked for accuracy. Another problem to watch for will be teachers who divert their attention away from their classrooms in order to work on dossiers. Such poor practice should be monitored. Students should be the primary concern of teachers.

Teachers should be given help in compiling their dossier to "make it the best presentation possible." The dossier ultimately is a means of self-evaluation. Putting together a dossier can "reward the teacher in a very intrinsic way" as well as reward for moving up the ladder. "This will provide a lot of incentive and feelings of self worth."

It was generally expressed that teachers should remain in the classroom, even as they move up the ladder. "Good teachers belong in the classroom, not out doing various administrative or extra work tasks." However, short times away from teaching were seen to be excellent, providing a period of rejuvenation necessary in any career.

Much discussion focused on the concept of teacher professionalism: are teachers viewed as professionals in the same manner as doctors, lawyers, accountants? Most reviewers felt that teacher indeed were professionals, but with significant differences from other groups that have implications for

evaluation. Most professionals in this society are autonomous and competitive, while teachers are seen as cooperative and collaborative. Other professionals compete for clients, while teachers have a "provided" clientele. Most other professionals are self-employed, while teachers are employed by the state. These differences mean that teachers have to be more systematically evaluated than other professionals. "Because teachers are not of a free rein in many respects, they need to be supervised closely." The term semi-professional may be appropriate.

Attention should be paid a teacher's recourse for poor evaluation, appeal procedures should be established. "Evaluation may be necessary, but teachers must be able to challenge that evaluation." In addition, all certificated personnel should be required to undergo evaluation, including administrators, part-time teachers, and special program teachers.

The Promotion Panel was the topic of much debate. Some members said that a peer panel would work well. They cautioned that teachers from other schools should be used to avoid creating conflicts within work groups. It was suggested that grade levels (i.e., elementary, secondary) not judge each other's dossiers. However, other reviewers maintained that Panel membership should include community members, both parent and non-parent.

There was great agreement that a key to a successful career ladder design would be parental involvement. Most said that this involvement should take place through mandatory parent surveys because "parents know how their child reacts to school and to various teachers. There are certain things [about teachers] that children know," and this valuable needs to be sampled. However, to be effective, the parent survey [presented at that time to the reviewers] needs considerable revision. It should be expanded from "yes-no" to a scale, have room for comments, and include items about student challenge, understanding and an overall satisfaction rating. Teachers and parents should be involved in the final design of any survey forms.

Reviewers pointed out the necessity for demotion provisions. A clear system of review needs to be included. Another major unknown about this and other career ladder designs is the extent to which they will block teacher mobility. It was felt that the ability of teachers to move from one district to another should not be inhibited by having to give up earned and deserved career ladder status.

Overall, the career ladder design was seen to have good potential for increasing the attractiveness of teaching as a profession. It could provide many incentives and motivation. It could rid the profession of the "low salary, baby-sitting image." The procedures have a potential to "weed out poor teachers." Effective career ladder designs would increase public confidence in teachers by providing a plan for evalution which has "never

really existed before." Just having such a plan "has got to have an impact on public sentiment."

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' GROUP

Principal reviewers responded favorably to the career ladder design and concept. For teachers, the plan provides "much needed recognition, professional growth opportunities, commitment to the profession, and a chance to feel good about their efforts." For administrators, the design "takes the evaluative pressure off. It removes the traditionally adversarial teacher-administrator 'picking away at each other.'" For the public, the design provides increased confidence in the profession, and an assurance that quality teachers will be accomodated. The design has the potential to move mediocre teachers out of the system, and can force educators "to actually do something about those teachers who don't provide evidence of competence."

Compilation of the dossier was seen as the motivating force of the plan: "teachers have to perform well in order to put one together." The lack of formal requirements allows much freedom, yet attention is still demanded. One reviewer said "it is all self-directed, that is exciting!"

Problems are likely to occur under the plan, and careful monitoring, adjustment, and refining will be necessary. "Topping out" is a problem for which there is no current provision; additional incentives will have to be added. Suggestions were made for non-monetary benefits, such as assignments and participation in district decision making. Another major concern was the possibility that the dossier actually would not adequately represent the full work responsibilities of teachers, "and that would be a travesty."

The design needs specifications for demotion. Credibility requires that promoted teachers are monitored, and that there is not a large opportunity for coasting.

Possibilities of career ladder opportunities for administrators should be explored.

UTAH EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The feature of the career ladder design that would result in a "substantial salary increase" as part of promotion is a key idea. It would substantially change the present system of teacher pay by adding performance elements to longevity. Present sources of funding would not accomodate this approach, these costs need to be considered even in the design phase.

The longer term status of promotion feature was seen as a good one. While monitoring for quality is reasonable, the stability of the promotions is a desireable feature. Demotion should be unlikely; the more common experience should be more

permanence. Teachers who are able to demonstrate effectiveness over a long period of service should enjoy some stability as a result. Make clear that the one year fall back is for additional service only.

Job sharing opportunities should be a part of the design. These increase options for teachers, and create more teaching placements for people in the society who want to teach. We need all the talented people we can get. Differentiation can apply to employment possibilities as well as duties. Good teachers should be paid professional wages, regardless of their position on the ladder.

Considerable jargon in plan ("serious reviews," "exemplary," "promotion panel," "mainline") could catch on in the profession and be helpful. While it makes the intial plan a bit more difficult to understand, eventually it could actually aid in communication.

The lack of emphasis on additional duties in the mainline promotions is a form of merit pay, and should be recognized as such. While previous merit pay approaches have not been successful, there is a counter pressure to reward good teachers and keep them in the classroom.

Attention should be paid to newcomers; the plan begins to address this. Particuarly helpful will be smaller classes, mentors, and contact with good teachers. While a preservice program is needed for a good foundation, most of what good teachers know they get from other good teachers. The attention to better working conditions would be an important, as one reviewer put it, "a super injection" into the system. At present, too much poor treatment of new teachers is done, like just dropping beginners into overcrowed classrooms, letting them sink or swim.

The plan could go as far as permitting Senior Teachers to make as much or more salary than principals. This would have important implications for the profession. Good administrators do make a difference, including in what is done in the classroom; but good teachers should be substantially rewarded. A positive feature of high pay is that it would enable some good teachers to stay in the classroom rather than to be forced to leave because of financial, rather than professional, reasons. One comment was that some present principals might leave administration to return to classroom teaching; in fact they might be a source of excellent teachers that we have lost.

The design contains some radical innovations for the profession. For example, teachers in the upper ranks could be involved in personnel decisions. Teachers may need time to consider the implications of this addition. Teachers will have to take initiative in this area in order to gain the status, and concomitant pay, they desire. Progress and precedent has been noted in this area with some high school department chairs and

elementary pod organizations. The design could help to increase this teacher involvment.

The general notion of "responsibility for the professional health of the district" should be a positive feature. This might include not only hiring, but also dealing with poor teachers. This is a professional responsibility and function which teachers have not dealt with to the present.

Reviewers noted that a great deal of care should be taken in selecting specific items and criteria for the various lines of evidence. For example, access to materials may not be equitable in a district, so teachers should not be evaluated based on how well they provide materials. It was suggested that district level standards could be developed, but cautioned against districts adopting each others standards without careful deliberation by teachers.

The question of difficulties with student gain were addressed. While this is an important area of teacher quality, the problems with getting good, fair data were discussed. The difficulty of communicating these defensible reservations was noted. It certainly is not the case that educators are not interested in student gain, however they do have serious doubts that such data are easily useable for teacher evaluation purposes.

Development and impelementation costs of teacher evaluation and incentive plans are significant, but rarely considered in discussions. Large, new programs require not only money for teacher rewards, but also to design and experiment with the procedures and processes. Good teacher evaluation is expensive. External or additional development money is required. Pilot programs are needed and require funding.

The final topic was possible need for additional legislation directed at encouraging fair, consistent, valid evaluation. Standards and guidelines could be helpful. They should not be too restrictive on individual districts, but allow for local innovation and perspective.

ROWLAND HALL-ST. MARK'S SCHOOL (PRIVATE)

A teacher incentive program can be a valuable feature. However, even this beginning design is a very complicated set of changes. The question was raised about how difficult it will be to understand it. The complexity of procedures, ideas, and implications will cause problems for the teachers who are to benefit from it and for outsiders who are to understand and support it.

Private schools have an advantage of being able to develop their own local vision of quality education, and to press for it. In addition, they are in a position to pick up some of the better ideas from public education. Career ladders and teacher

incentives will be watched for benefits which can be applied in the private school setting.

Some teacher status system appears to be desireable. Whether it is the Associate, Master, Senior ladder of this plan, or something based more on levels of accomplishment and what has been done for the school, is not clear at this point. There does seem to be a place for titles and status based on long years of contribution to the school, along with additional pay.

Locally, there is some interest in topics of career ladders and incentives for teachers. The viewpoint seems to be more of a wait and see stance. It was noted that an informal discussion meeting scheduled earlier in the year got no attendance.

In general, consideration of possible career ladder designs was intriguing. However, it raises more questions than it furnishes obvious answers. Chief among the concerns is complexity. One area of consideration should be the numbers of ladder rungs. The bottom two seem to not quite be on the ladder, i.e., it is not likely that a paraprofessional will rise to higher status. Simplifying the steps could help make the system more understandable, and thus possible to implement.

It is recommended that the Promotion Panel, a key decision making group, be broadened to include more than just the peer teacher perspective. At least the viewpoints of students and administrators should be taken into account. One reviewer emphasized the necessity for balanced points of view on the Panel. Promotions for "bogus" reasons and favoritism could be well addressed by having balancing points of view in the promotion process.

It will be important to have a mechanism for demotion or falling back down on the ladder. There is a real hazard of creating conditions in which teachers can coast. There are too many examples in all of education of veteran teachers at the top end of the salary schedule who are burned out, while energetic and effective beginners have trouble buying a car. It was noted that a major objection to university-type tenure systems is that they work against accountability. Private schools are seen as much more vigorous in expecting high levels of performance from teachers, and dismissing those who are not outstanding--and maintain high performance levels. Year to year contracts, common for private school administrators and teachers, may result in "high job security anxiety, but they also result in high performance levels." Dedication to student welfare is high in private schools, and maintained by constant attention and accountability to teaching performance. "Schools are not operated in order to create teacher security, they function for the benefit of students!" This attitude accounts for the success and growth of RHSM school, according to the reviewers.

A comment was made that, on first review, the evaluation

system seems to emphasize more obvious cognitive data rather than some less tangible, but crucial teacher performance areas. For example, it is quite clear that quality teaching in elementary school levels includes subject matter and organization skills. However, other teacher attributes can be equally or even more important in evaluating quality. These include ability to teach social skills, flexibility, responsiveness, creating a learning ambience, enabling students to risk in their learning, and other qualities that we recognize in good teachers. Other reviewers added the private school expectations of service to students, parents, and the school. There exists a sense of expectation and tradition of private school education that sometimes can be difficult to describe, but which should be accounted for in an evaluaion system of teachers. Assessment might include professional logs of parent contacts, participation in student activites, and other indicators of concern. "Private school teachers are expected to care beyond mere school hours."

Several implications of teacher assessment and incentive systems were raised. There may be problems when some, but not all, teachers receive recognition for distinction. It was recognized that parents will become involved in making sure their students get the titled teachers. This has the possibility of destroying equal opportunity, rewarding some students for the insights of their parents. Use of teacher exams and student achievement data were addressed. Both of these areas have potential for improving the overall system, but also have many unanswered questions.

The review concluded with recognition of the difficulties of design and implementation of teacher incentive programs. Park City is not a typical Utah district, but does have some features that make success there possible. Utah faces many problems because of the large growth demands placed on a relatively small tax base.

APPENDIX D

PROMOTION PANEL LETTERS

May 29, 1985

Dear ,

Congratulations! The District Promotion Panel has found the evidence presented in your dossier to be recommending of your promotion to Associate Teacher. A more formal letter regarding our finding will follow within 10 days.

While the decision to promote was based on the overall strength of the case in your dossier, the Panel particularly was impressed with the following evidence which you presented:

[LIST SEVERAL SPECIFICS HERE]

We appreciate your efforts in documenting your teaching effectiveness. It is recognized that a successful dossier requires good teaching performance, time for assembly, and care in organization. Your work in these regards has been beneficial to the District.

[NAME]
Presiding Chair,
District Promotion Panel

1985

Dear

The Promotion Panel found your dossier insufficiently strong to recommend promotion at this time. You will receive a more formal letter regarding this finding within 10 days.

It is recognized that a successful dossier requires a good deal of work, documentation of effective teaching, and care in organization. The decision to promote is based on the overall strength of the case presented by the applicant and not merely on an accumulation of details, however positive. Judgment must be made by at least five of the eight members that the dossier presents compelling evidence of teaching performance which merits promotion. (Compelling means obvious and without a doubt.) Numbers of lines of evidence and comparisons with other dossiers are not primary bases for decision making.

Aside from the decision, Panel members suggest the following areas in which the data presented in the dossier case resulted in doubts about promotion at this time:

[LIST SEVERAL SPECIFICS HERE]

You are eligible to reapply next school year. If for any reason you are concerned that this Panel decision was not done according to specifications, or that procedures for your review were not as they should have been, you should contact [NAME] who is the Oversight person at your school. [S]he will inform you of appeal procedures and help you to begin the process if you choose.

Thank you for your efforts.

[NAME]
Presiding Chair,
Promotion Panel

APPENDIX E

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, Ca: Rand Corporation.

Burke, B. (1982). Merit pay for teachers: Round valley may have the answer. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 265-267.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A., & Pease, S. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 53 (3), 285-328.

Educational Commission of the States (1983). A summary of major reports on education. Denver, Colorado.

Educational Research Service (1979). Merit pay for teachers. ERS Report. Arlington, Virginia. ERIC Document 166 844.

English, F.W. (1984). Still searching for excellence. Educational Leadership, 34-35.

Frase, L., Hetzel, R. & Grant, R. (1982). Merit pay: A research based alternative in Tucson. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 268-269.

French, R. (1984). Dispelling myths about Tennessee's career ladder program. Educational Leadership, December, 9-13.

Kauchak, D. (1984). Testing teachers in Louisiana: A closer look. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (9), 626-629.

Hatry, H., & Greiner, J. (1984). Issues in teacher incentive plans. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

Kauchak, D., Peterson, K. & Discroll, A. (1985). An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. Journal of Research & Development in Education. In press.

Lewis, A. (1982). Evaluating educational personnel. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators.

Little, J.W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 325-340.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Marsh, D.D. (1979). Staff development and school change. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.), Staff development. New York: Teachers College Press.

Millman, J. (1981). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Natriello, G. & Cohn, M. (1985). Critical issues in the development of a merit pay system. Administrator's Notebook, 31 (3), 1-4.

Peterson, K. & Kauchak, D. (1982). Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises. Salt Lake City: Center for Professional Practice, Univ. of Utah (ERIC Document ED 233 996).

Peterson, K. (1984). Technical problems in teacher evaluation. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17 (4), 62-70.

Rist, R. (1980). Qualitative policy analysis: A case study of an emergent methodology. American Sociological Association, New York.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (1), 349-355.

Say, E., & Miller, L. (1982). The second mile plan: Incentive pay for Houston teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 270-271.

Schlechty, P., Joslin, A., Leak, S. & Hanes, R. (1984). The Charlotte-Mecklenburg teacher career development program. Educational Leadership, December, 4-8.

Scriven, M. (1975). Handbook for model training program in qualitative educational evaluation. Berkeley: School of Education, Univ. of California.

Scriven, M. (1981). Teacher evaluation. In J. Millman (Ed.). Handbook of teacher evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Weeks, K. & Cornett, L. (1985). Planning Career Ladders: Lessons from the States. Atlanta: Career Ladder Clearinghouse.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica: Rand Corp.